

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/757,919	Applicant(s) TOTH ET AL.	
	Examiner Katherine W. Mitchell	Art Unit 3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell. (3)_____.

(2) Jon Shackelford. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: week of 2/3/2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: independent.

Identification of prior art discussed: 6513810, related.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: First, examiner sincerely thanks applicant for his professionalism and exceptional cooperation and thoroughness in evaluating the claims in light of the cited art. Since it is clear tht applicant is attempting to define claims over the art of record, examiner called to suggest possible wording for allowance, noting that all found art thus far required the 1st collar to bend wirth respect to the second collar along with that both 1st and 2nd collars were directly contact with the shaft along the entire collar length. However, there is no guarantee this limitation would not be found, but if it were agred to, examiner would search for this "further limitation" prior to any action, and would call if it were found for further discussions. However, the Imitaiton had to be agreed to prior to any further office action.

Applicant pointed out several suggested limitaitons which would not work, and various proposals were discussedfor applicant to review with the inventor. However, examiner noted that USPTO requirements were that she turn in the case by 2/6. If agreement could not be confirmed by COB 2/3/2006, examiner would provide office action..